

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 12-23, 25 and 27-49 are pending.

In the Official Action, Claims 1-10, 12-23, 25 and 27-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawai (U.S. Patent No. 6,137,485) in view of Comstock (U.S. Patent No. 5,692,073).

Briefly recapitulating, Claim 1 is directed to a system for managing video teleconferencing devices configured to exchange audio/video data. The system includes a management adapter accessible to a user interface. The management adapter has a list that identifies a video teleconferencing device configured to exchange audio/video data. The system also includes a device access layer interfaced with the management adapter and the video teleconferencing device. The device access layer represents the video teleconferencing devices as objects to support management of the video teleconferencing devices through the management adapter during set up or conduct of an active video teleconference. The present invention provides a video network platform that simplifies video network device management by offering access through a single common interface. With the present invention a business may interface common video network management applications to manage disparate video devices, even devices that have native formats are different from that of the management application.¹

Kawai describes an image transmission and method apparatus for transmitting/receiving images among a plurality of terminals connected to a network, and an image transmission system including the apparatus.² In one embodiment an access state display window can be displayed on display 26. In Figure 3, reference numeral 60 denotes an

¹ Specification, page 12, lines 3-14.

² Kawai, Abstract.

observer list field for displaying a list of observers who are observing the image picked up by the video camera 30 and transmitted onto network 12. The list field 60 displays the login name of the communications terminal of each observer. If there are a plurality of observers, the field 60 displays a list of the login names of all the observers. Reference numeral 62 denotes an operator field for displaying the name of an operator whose remote controlling the camera 30 at present.³

However, contrary to the Official Action Kawai does not disclose or suggest a system for managing video teleconferencing devices. In particular, Kawai does not disclose or suggest a management adapter accessible to a user interface let alone a management adapter having a list that identifies video teleconferencing devices configured to exchange audio/video data.

Kawai also fails to disclose a device access layer interfaced with the management adapter and the video teleconferencing device. In particular, Kawai fails to disclose a device access layer representing the video teleconferencing devices as objects to support management of the video teleconferencing devices.

The observer list of Kawai cited in the Official Action merely identifies terminals/users that are connected to an active network. The observer list performs *no* management functions and, as acknowledged in the Official Action, the observer list does not represent video teleconferencing device as object to support management. In summary, in Kawai no management is being performed with or through the observer list. At most the observer list identifies which terminal is remote controlling a camera.

Comstock describes a system apparatus and method for managing media in a multimedia conferencing system according to media roles. Each media stream is explicitly labeled with a role that describes the function or purpose of the stream, of just people or

³ Kawai column 4, lines 38-50.

content. Labels may be hierarchal and may include layers for media type, additional media source description, etc. A policy manager is provided for managing roles, such that the multimedia conference may be more effectively presented to participants. A token management system may also be provided so that control of the multimedia conference roles can be transferred during the conference.⁴

Figure 1 of Comstock shows a video conferencing system that may be used with the Comstock invention. The devices shown in Figure 1 of Comstock may be realized as separate physical machines, and separate logical machines on a single computer, or a separate processes on a single logical machine, or some combination therein.⁵

However, contrary to the Official Action, Comstock also fails to disclose or suggest referencing devices as objects. In fact Comstock does not disclose representing the devices as any abstract concept let alone an object. Furthermore, column 5, lines 1-20 of Comstock also fail to disclose representing a device as an object, let alone as a management bean as recited in Claim 2.

MPEP §706.02(j) notes that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Also, the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Without addressing the first two prongs of the test of obviousness, Applicants submit that the Official Action does not present a *prima facie* case of

⁴ Comstock, Abstract.

⁵ Comstock column 3, lines 19-55.

obviousness because both Kawai and Comstock fail to disclose all the features of Applicants' claimed invention.

Accordingly, in view of the present amendment and in light of the previous discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and expect and early and favorable action to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Michael E. Monaco
Registration No. 52,041

I:\ATTY\MM\263556US-AM2.DOC